

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದಪೀರಪ್ಪ.)

ವನ್ನಿಟ್ಟು ಸುಮಾರು 80 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳೂ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತೇಜನ ಕೊಡುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅವರನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಸೆಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಿತ್ರರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಡಾ|| ಅರ್. ನಾಗನಗೌಡ (ವ್ಯವಸಾಯದ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ, ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಸುಬ್ಬಮ್ಮನವರು ಏಲಕ್ಕಿ ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಏಲಕ್ಕಿ ಪೈರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಧವಾದ ರೋಗ ಬಂದಿದೆ, ಬಹಳ ನಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್ಚರಲ್ ರಿಸರ್ಚ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯವರು ಏಲಕ್ಕಿ ಬೆಳೆಯ ರೋಗವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸಂಶೋಧನೆ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವರ್ಷ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿ ಈ ರೋಗದ ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರೀಶ್ವರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘವಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಏಲಕ್ಕಿ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ರೆಗ್ಯುಲೇಟಿಡ್ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಜರುಗಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹನೀಯರು ಹೇಗೆ ಸಾಲವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬರಮಾಡಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಪಡಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬ ಮಾತಿ ಈ ಸಂಘದಿಂದ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು, ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸಹಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್ ಅವರು ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್ಚರಲ್ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್ಚರಲ್ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಆಗಲಿ, ರಿಸರ್ವ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಗಲಿ, ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಗಲಿ, ಯಾವುದೇ ಆಗಲಿ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಹಣ ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಹೇಳುವ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಅಂಶವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್ಚರಲ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾದುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಸೆಂಟ್ರಲ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿನವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ರಿಸರ್ವ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿನವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ, ಇಲ್ಲವಾದರೆ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಹಣ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಲು ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಬೇಕಾದರೆ 2½ ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವರ್ಷ ಮೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸೆಂಟ್ರಲ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿ, change the system of public loans ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಸಿಸ್ಟಂ ಥೇಂಜ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಅಥವಾ ಏನು ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ಪಚ್ಚೆಲ ಶ್ಯಾನುಕೋಗರು, ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಇನ್ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರು ಮುಂತಾದವರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಎಂದು ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯನವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಕೇಳಿ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಚುರ್ಚಿಸಿತು. ನಮ್ಮ ಕಾಲ ಮೇಲೆ ನಿಂತರೆ ಸಹಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರ ಮೇಲೆ ಆಧಾರಪಟ್ಟಿ ವಿನೂ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಂದಿನವರೆಗೆ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರ ಮೇಲೆ ಆಧಾರವಾಗಿರುತ್ತೇವೆಯೋ ಅಲ್ಲಿನವರೆಗೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ರಿಸರ್ವ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿನವರು 2½ ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಸಿದ್ಧರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವರ್ಷ 25 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ತಮ್ಮ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಹರಿಜನರ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳಾಗಿ, ಲೋನ್ ಬೇರರ್ ಆಗಿ, ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಧಾರರು ಮುಂತಾದವರಾಗಿ ಅದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕ. ಈಗ ಹಣವಿದೆ, ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯಿದೆ, ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರ ಕೈಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಹಣ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. 100 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದು ಕೈಗೆ ಬರುವಾಗ 25 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತವೆಂದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಈ ಸಂಘಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸಹಾಯ ಅವುಗಳಿಂದ ದೊರೆಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

ಈಗ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಹರಿಜನರಿಗೆ, ಹಿಂದುಳಿದವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಮದ್ರಾ ಸಿನಿಲ್ಟ ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಿಶ್ಚಿಯನ್ ಸೆಂಟ್ರಲ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಆದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸಹಾಯವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಅದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗಲಾರದು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ 10—12 ವರ್ಷ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಮುಚ್ಚಬೇಕಾಯಿತು. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಸುಮಾರು 70 ಲಕ್ಷ ಹರಿಜನರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಬೇಕು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಆದಾಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ರಿಸರ್ವ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕು ಕೊಡುವ ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸಂಘಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳಾಗಿ ಬೇಕು. ನಮ್ಮ ಊರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸಂಘಗಳಿವೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹರಿಜನರನ್ನು ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್‌ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅವರು ಬಡವರಾದರೂ ಪರವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಅನ್ನಿ ಸಹ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇರಬೇಕಾದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ರೈತರೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಸಂಘಗಳಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಾಲ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ತಾವು ಕೇಳಿರುವಂತೆ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕು ಮೂಲಕ ಹಣ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,02,77,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1955, in respect of ‘Loans and Advances by the State Government’.”

The motion was adopted.

## DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1953-54.

5 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What time shall we fix for debate on the Supplementary Grants ?

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA (Sagar—Hosanagar).—No time limit. Very many subjects there are to be dealt with.

ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ನಾನೇನೂ ಈ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಅನುಮತಿಸುವುದಾಗಿ ಮುಗಿಸಿಬಿಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ನಿರ್ಧಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದು. ಅನೇಕ ಮನವಿಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆ ತನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವಿಶದವಾಗಿ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಲು ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದೇ ಇರುವುದು ವಿಷಾದಕರವಾದ ವಿಷಯ.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I must state you have not understood me or the House. (After a pause) No doubt cut motions have been tabled. But one or two cut motions used to be discussed and the whole main demand used to be put to vote. Even then there used to be not so much scope to express their views on particular demands. I therefore decided—I have made myself clear—and the House has come to some agreement. There has been a clear understanding. Now, at the close of all these demands and that too when all the demands are passed, you pass such remarks. Is it desirable Sri Gopala Gowda? You are no doubt at liberty to pass any remark but it must be reasonable.

**Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.**—I am sorry, Sir. ಈ ಗ್ರಾಂಟುಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವಿಶದವಾಗಿ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಲು ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದೆ, ಅಷ್ಟೆ.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—That is over. Grants are over. I am now asking whether it is desirable to fix a time limit about supplementary demands—till six of the clock or 6-30. A reasonable time is necessary. Is the House agreeable to sit till 6-30?

**Several MEMBERS.**—Yes.

**Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).**—I think the Hon'ble the Chief Minister may move the demands to save time and I suggest that we may be permitted to cover up all the demands.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Yes, quite so.

**Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.**—We have hardly two hours before us. But we will try to finish it earlier.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—At what time?

**Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Leader of the House).**—You may have one hour.

**Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.**—I think we can have the debate till 6-30.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I am now speaking to the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition. What time can we have?

**Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.**—We can have till 6-30.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—What does the Leader of the House say?

**Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.**—Time cannot be made elastic.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—But when once we fix the time limit I will apply guillotine.

**Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.**—He said till 6-30. I agree.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Yes. Then I move all the demands. Motion moved:

“That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the list of Additional and Supplementary Demands for Grants for the year 1953-54 circulated among the Members be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March 1954 in respect of Demands Nos. 9, 18, 23, 26, 29, 34, 40, 41 and 42.”

Now the debate.

**Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).**—I rise to oppose all these supplementary demands.

**\*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).**—I can understand if you oppose one or two demands, but not all.

**\*Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.**—Sir, this Ministry has a knack to take us by surprise. The latest surprise they have given us is to introduce this third instalment of supplementary demands. Previously we had to deal with two lists of supplementary demands. The first one asked the House to vote a supplementary demand of nearly one crore of rupees. The second supplementary demand sought the permission of the House for an expenditure over and above the sanctioned estimate of nearly a crore and a half. Now, we are asked to vote this supplementary demand, just on the day we have finished discussion of the Budget Demands for the year 1954-55. In the first place, I must state that the procedure adopted by the Finance Minister in introducing and asking us to agree to this supplementary demand is highly irregular if not illegal. Because, all supplementary demands must be passed ordinarily before the introduction of the Budget, because all these items which have been spent

(Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

must find a place and must be included in the Budget for the ensuing year. But now there is no indication of the spending of these various amounts and so these have not been taken into consideration in the regular Budget for the next year and we are now asked to vote items when the time has passed. Sir, apparently it looks to be an innocent demand. They have asked us only for a sum of Rs. 1,700, as token demand. But really speaking, they have been asking for an extra sum of nearly Rs. 35 to 40 lakhs. Under demand No. 9 they ask us—I believe they have already spent—Rs. 25,000; under Demand No. 18 they have spent Rs. 15,000; under Demand No. 23 they have spent Rs. 3,13,000; under Demand No. 26 Industries and Supplies they need Rs. 3,84,000; under Demand No. 29—they have not given us the actual figures; they want money to build overhead reservoir to the combined Hospital, Bangalore, and construct an additional block to New Mental Hospital, Bangalore, and cement concrete about 13 miles of road, which comes to nearly Rs. 15 lakhs and more; under Demand No. 40 there is no indication of the amount they want but they require about Rs. 2,16,000 to meet the pay of the Chief Engineer who has been recently appointed and also the expenditure of 4 Public Works Divisions and 13 Sub-Divisions and under Demand No. 42 they want Rs. 1,18,000 under Electricity Schemes. In all they want nearly virtually Rs. 36 lakhs in the guise of a token demand of only Rs. 1,700 (*A Voice*: Is this extra amount?) Extra amount which has been already spent by this time, because 31-3-1954 is only 2 days more. So all this amount must have been spent by this time and so they ought to have been included in the revised estimate. That has not been done and that is why I say it is highly irregular. If these amounts are included and taken into consideration, the whole Budget will have to be changed. If we include Rs. 35 lakhs in the revised estimate only, it will have its repercussion on the Budget for 1954-55. The opening balance will have to be reduced by 20 lakhs and

consequently the deficit would increase from 309 lakhs to 340 lakhs.

Sir, that is why I call this irregular and I do not know why the Finance Minister did not include this in the regular items of the revised estimate. These items were accepted long ago, Sir. In fact many of the items have been sanctioned in the months of December and February. I can give you an instance. The Chief Engineer's place for instance. Under the Demand 40, a Special Chief Engineer has been appointed for looking after the works connected with the Bhadra Reservoir and starting of public works sub-divisions. These were sanctioned by the Government long ago and the Chief Engineer for Irrigation was appointed long ago. Why was not this item of expenditure included under the revised estimates? I think the Government have not explained. These items of expenditure are not of recent occurrence, but still they have not included in the Budget.

Similarly, Sir, I can give other instances. For example, contribution to Depressed Class Amelioration Fund and development schemes for the welfare of criminals. All these were passed in the month of February 1954. Government orders were passed long ago sanctioning these amounts, but they were not included in the Budget. The net effect of that is this and now we are asked to vote an extra amount of Rs. 35,00,000 which will affect the financial position very much and it will enhance the deficit from 309 lakhs to nearly 340 lakhs. This will wipe off the closing balance of 42 lakhs. At the end of 1954-55, the closing balance is 42 lakhs and if this amount is to be met out of the closing balance, the closing balance will be wiped out and this will leave the finances of the State in a very unstable position. The fact that they did not include these figures in the revised figures leads us to one conclusion and that is that they did not want to show the House the actual financial position.

Again, Sir, I must submit that these amounts are going to be met from the savings. It is all right; these amounts can be re-appropriated if there are

enough savings out of the sanctioned items. But in many cases we find that there are no savings at all. For example, I go to '40. Rural Development'. A sum of Rs. 3,13,000 had to be re-appropriated. The sanctioned figure for the year 1953-54 was 31,52,000. The revised estimate is 34,24,000. So they have spent nearly 3 lakhs more than the sanctioned figure. So I would like to know where are the savings and from which source you are going to re-appropriate. If the full budget allotment has not been fully utilised, and if there are savings, then you can divert the savings towards some other items. But here you find there are hardly any savings; on the other hand, you have spent much more than the grant provided. And that is only one instance.

Then you take another item '50. Civil Works'; the amount sanctioned was 236 lakhs; the revised figure is 278 lakhs. Thereby, you have spent 42 lakhs more than the sanctioned amount, and there are no savings at all; but still you want to re-appropriate 15 lakhs. From which source are you going to re-appropriate and where are the savings? Re-appropriation generally presumes that there are savings out of the sanctioned items. Suppose you had a provision of 300 lakhs and they have spent only 280 lakhs; there will be savings of 20 lakhs and that amount can be re-appropriated for any other item of expenditure. But here, you have no savings. You have spent much more than the grant provided. That is what has happened in regard to many items here. Similarly, 'I.N.E.D. 40.' The grant provided under the Budget was 156 lakhs. The revised estimate is 248 lakhs. So you have spent nearly 80 lakhs more than the sanctioned items; and now you want to re-appropriate 2 lakhs which is not at all available. So, I submit, Sir, the procedure adopted by the Government is highly irregular and they want to re-appropriate from sources which are non-existent and which are not at all available. What I would like to know is this: when the Government accorded sanction long ago, and when they knew that it was a definite and specific item of expenditure,

they ought to have included them under the regular budget item. Now if all the items of expenditure are to be passed, it will only increase our liabilities by at least 35 to 40 lakhs. That will make our financial position still more hopeless, and next year's Budget will be very much affected by passing these additional items of expenditure which have been brought before us under the guise of token grants. On these grounds, I oppose all these demands.

**Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR** (T.-Narasipur).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I oppose the Supplementary Estimates. I support the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition. This is the third instalment of Supplementary Demands. We had already two supplementary estimates and I believe it is not a good policy to place before this House a number of supplementary estimates in the course of one year. It automatically means that budgeting is not properly done; and what I have said is well supported by the observation of the Auditor-General. He has said that taking the total expenditure into consideration, the total savings amounted to 17.8 per cent of the entire provision. This relates to the Appropriation Accounts of 50-51. Sir, if they want to appropriate out of the various heads, it means that there has to be savings and to what extent they have over-estimated their demands is proved by statistics, which I am going just now to narrate. In the year 1950-51 out of 52 demands, there was only one demand where there was no variation between the final provision and the actuals and so also in 1952-53. In 1950-51 the variations below 2 per cent are registered in five cases and in 1952-53 it goes up to 9. Variations above 2 per cent and less than 10 per cent are noticed in 21 cases in 50-51 while in 1952-53 in the case of 28 demands the variation ranges between 10 to 20 per cent. In the case of one demand the variation exceeds 20 per cent and is within 30 per cent in 1950-51, whereas in the case of 3 demands in 1952-53, the variation is up to 40 per cent of the demand; and in one case, the variation is 80.8 per cent. In



(SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.)

four cases in 1950-51, the variation has been 100 per cent.

Well, Sir, if all these things are taken into consideration the variations will be up to 16 per cent of the total provision. If budgeting is done with such a wide variation, naturally there will not only be savings but also a very good excuse for further taxation on account of the deficit and to cover up the deficit you will bring in legislation to tax the people, all the time being fully conscious that there will be very good savings; otherwise, you would not have brought this Supplementary Estimates at all. Sir, on the Supplementary Estimates that have been brought before us, I would like to offer a few observations.

Under Demand No. 9 you have said that you want sanction for three works. Well, Sir, we had a Supplementary Estimate in the month of July and another in the month of January and I would like to know why these three works were not included either in the month of July or January. Why should Government now introduce at the late hour of the year when they will not be able to spend anything? In two days the financial year closes. Sir, this presupposes that you take up the work with the executive sanction and just to regularise, you have brought them before this House to get the sanction now. I think, it is not proper.

Under Demand No. 18 you have asked for a token grant and in the Explanation it is said that the token grant is for the purpose of employing additional teachers in accordance with the programme of the Government of India for solving the unemployment problem. But, under the definition given by the Public Accounts Committee, I do not think it would be treated as new service. Additional equipment and additional staff is for increased work; so, the employment of additional teachers for purely temporary need cannot be treated new service.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—40 per cent of it would be additional staff and the rest for new institutions; there

are both the features. We have been asked by the Accountant-General to treat it as such and we received a letter only on 24th March.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Very well, Sir. Thirdly, there is this creation of the Depressed Class Amelioration Fund which was a thing known to Government long back. The Chief Minister did assure us that he is going to see that the fund is created and the allotment will not be allowed to lapse. Then why did not Government bring this in the month of January? That needs a little explanation.

The fourth thing is under Demand No. 29. You have stated that you want this token grant for the execution of the works noted in the Explanatory Note. But, unfortunately the amount of estimate is not given and we are giving a vote blindly. We do not know how much it comes to and we are not sure whether these works should have been taken this year alone. After all, the year is going to be closed in a day or two. If these works had already been thought of you would have really included them in the Budget itself. If you know these works were necessary you would have done it. Hence the Government should explain the urgency.

The other thing is, under Demand 41 it is stated that administrative sanction was accorded in December 1953. The administrative sanction was accorded in December 1953 for the installation of a Spun Cast Iron Pipe Plant at a total cost of Rs. 45 lakhs. If that was so this could have been brought under the January estimate.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—The cause of action for all these things has arisen in the month of February. If I say that much, I am sure, you will be satisfied. Otherwise, certainly we could have brought this in the second Supplementary Budget.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Sir, the last thing is under Demand No. 42. You have proposed one power line to Channagiri from master unit sub-station, Chitaldrug, an estimated cost of Rs. 1,18,000. Sir, if that was the intention of the Government, they could have as well brought it under

Development Scheme of Hydro-Electric Works at the time of preparing the estimate. This master unit sub-station did exist prior to March 1953 and this could have been brought under Development Schemes. I do not know why it was delayed. Was it thought late? Supposing they had thought of it late, they could have taken up in the year 54-55. Therefore, I submit most of these things have arisen because your budgeting has been defective. But for the fact you know that you will have savings, you would not have brought this. Why should you prepare an estimate in such a manner as to foresee a saving and why should you bring this Supplementary Estimate? I know definitely you are not asking us any more money.

**Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA** (Chief Minister).—I am glad you are enlightening your leader. (*Laughter*).

**Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR**.—You could have decreased the deficit; that is what my leader said. So, Sir, it is always better to have a correct budgeting and give a correct picture rather than prepare a budget arbitrarily and expect a saving and proceed with these Supplementary Estimates.

\*ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ (ಸಾಗರ-ಹೊಸ ನಗರ).—ಸ್ಯಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಈ ಸಖಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಎಸ್ತಿ ಮೇಲನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ಲೇಷಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಈ ಮನವಿಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದೆರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗತಾನೆ ನಾವು 1954-55 ನೆಯ ಸಾಲಿನ ಆಯವ್ಯಯದ ಅಂದಾಜು ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಸಖಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಎಸ್ತಿ ಮೇಲುಗಳಿಗೆ, ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯೂನರ್ವಿಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿರುವ ಕೆಲವು ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಮನವಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

5-30 P.M.

ಈಗ ತಾನೇ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ಐಯ್ಯಂಗಾರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕಾರಣಗಳು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರವಾಗಿ ವಾದ ಮಾಡಿ ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನನಗೆ ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಉರುಳಿ ಹೋಗುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬಂದಾಗ ಹೀಗೆ ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಅಶ್ವಾಸನಗಳನ್ನು ಈಡೇರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದು ಒಂದು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಯಿತೋ ಏನೋ ಎಂದು . . . .

**Mr. SPEAKER**.—That is an aspersions and you must have sufficient grounds to make such remarks.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಐಟಂಗಳಿವೆ; ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ the administrative sanction was accorded in December 1953 ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿಯೇ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು.

**Mr. SPEAKER**.—You can ask why it was not brought before the House earlier.

**Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA**.—But this is not question hour; that is my opinion. ನನಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇನ್ನೇನೂ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇರತಕ್ಕ ನಿಜಾಂಶದ ಮೇಲೆ ನನಗೆ ತೋರಿದ ಎರಡು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಉಪಾಪೋಹ ಮಾಡಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

**Mr. SPEAKER**.—Is it stated anywhere in making these demands, under any of these items, that they are made with a view to satisfy some of their friends or members or some others? Is it not imaginary? What else is it?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಈಗ Depressed Class Amelioration Fund ಇದೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿದರೆ ನನ್ನ ಹರಿಜನ ಮಿತ್ರರಾರೂ ತಪ್ಪು ತಿಳಿಯಬಾರದು. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ, ಈ ಫಂಡಿಗೆ ಮೊದಲೇ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದು, ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಬಂದಾಗ ಅವರನ್ನು ತೃಪ್ತಿಪಡಿಸೋಣ ಎಂಬ ನೆಪದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸುವ ಬದಲು, ಮೊದಲೇ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು, ಏನೋ ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟಿತ್ತು, ಆದುದರಿಂದ ತಂದಿರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು.

(Sri T. Hanumiah rose.)

**Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA**.—I do not yield to the Member.

**Sri T. HANUMIAH** (Hiriyur—Scheduled Castes).—Sir, on a point of order . . . .

**Mr. SPEAKER**.—If it is a point of order, then the member is bound to yield. What is the point of order?

**Sri T. HANUMIAH**.—What the Member says is a reflection on the Harijan Members. ಅವರು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸರಿಸಮಾನರೋ ಹರಿಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಸರಿಸಮಾನರು. ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಟೀಕಿಸುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದೇ ನನ್ನ point of order.

**Mr. SPEAKER**.—It is pointed out in page 3 of the Explanatory Memorandum and I also very well remember that the Chief Minister who is also the Finance Minister was pleased to say that a separate fund for Depressed Classes Amelioration will be created shortly and that no amount will be allowed to lapse. Even if it is not spent during the year it

(MR. SPEAKER.)

will be added on to this fund. He made: that statement I remember during the course of this month. And there is also another sentence to be noted: "The administrative sanction for the implementation of the scheme has been accorded in February 1954." In accordance with that assurance given on the floor of this Legislature this fund has been created. It is not with a view to satisfy any member or any other gentleman outside or here but that was a legitimate demand on the part of those people and the Government has seen its way and has recognised that it is a legitimate demand and has sanctioned it. To go beyond that and make remarks casting aspersions is not desirable.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molakalmuru).—It is not a new grant either.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Quite so; it is creation of the fund.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Recently in my Budget speech I have mentioned this, as you, Sir, have correctly pointed out. I said as follows:—

"Government are also constituting, as a special case, a Depressed Class Amelioration Fund to ensure that no portion of the allotted grants lapses."

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ತಾವು ಈಗ ತಾನೇ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ವಿವರಣೆಗಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಅಭಿನಂದಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ point of order ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಏನೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Strictly speaking it is not a point of order. It is a sort of explanation he sought at my hands and I have made the matter clear. So far as Sri T. Hanumiah was concerned his point was that you must not cast aspersions against Harijan Members; there was no ground for you to make such aspersions. That is all I can say.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ತಾನೇ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಹರಿಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು point of order ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸುತ್ತಾ ನಾನು ತಿಳಿಸಿದುದು ಹರಿಜನರ ಮೇಲೆ aspersion ಆಯಿತೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದು ನನಗೆ ಅತ್ಯರ್ಥವನ್ನುಂಟು ಮಾಡಿದೆ! ನಾನು ಯಾವ ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಏನನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಎರಡು

ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅಶ್ವಾಸನವನ್ನು ಈಡೇರಿಸುವದಕ್ಕೆ, ಅವರನ್ನು ತೃಪ್ತಿಪಡಿಸುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ. ಇದು ಹೇಗೆ aspersion ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ?

(Sri B. Narayanaswamy rose.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—You please resume your seat, Sri Narayanaswamy. Explanation is given. It is quite satisfactory. He is simply repeating.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹಣಕಾಸನ್ನು ಹಂಚುವಾಗ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗಲ್ಲ, ಅನುಕೂಲವನ್ನು ದೊರಕಿಸಿಕೊಡುವ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಪಾಲಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅಗತ್ಯ. ಇಂಥ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಪಾಲಿಸಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಮೂಲಕ ತೋರಿಸಬಹುದು. ಈಗ ರತ್ನಂ ವಿಧ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯ ಯೋಜನೆಯಾಗಲಿ, ನ್ಯಾಷನಲ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಟೆಂಷನ್ ಸ್ಕೀಂ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ಆರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾಗಲಿ, ಕೆರೆಕಟ್ಟುವುದಾಗಲಿ, ರಿಜರ್ವಾಯರ್ ಕಟ್ಟುವುದಾಗಲಿ, ರಸ್ತೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಸುವುದಾಗಲಿ—ಈ ಯಾವ ಕೆಲಸವೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಈಗ ಪ್ರಭಾವದ ಮೇಲೆ ಆಗುತ್ತಿದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಬೇರೆ ರೀತಿ ಆಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಉಪಯೋಗವಿಲ್ಲ, ಜನತೆಗೆ ಉಪಯೋಗವಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿರುವ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳ ರೀತಿ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಸಾರ್ವತ್ರಿಕ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಕ್ಷೇಮಕರವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲೋ ಅಲ್ಲೆ-ಇಲ್ಲ ಜನರ ತೃಪ್ತಿ ಸಮಾಧಾನಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಾರ್ಯನೀತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಈ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, on a point of information, if the Hon'ble Minister can give me. Can he say under which item the amount is saved and is available for re-appropriation?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—The Budget Memorandum itself contains. It clearly shows the savings under each item.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You wanted some information. I am under the impression that such information will be supplied during the next Session when the actual savings will be known. Generally that is the practice.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—Sir, it is my unpleasant duty to perform disagreeable tasks. But I have no hesitation in saying what I think is right and in doing what I consider to be my duty. In placing these Supplementary Demands before this House, Government have placed proposals for incurring expenditure the full implications of which and the details of which, such as could be ascertained even now, have not been furnished to this House.

It will be seen by any Hon'ble Member who has the time and the inclination to read these Supplementary Demands and the grants upon which these token grants are asked for, that the entire scheme of these Supplementary Demands has been prepared in a spirit not merely of carelessness, but in a spirit of want of sufficient responsibility. I say this with particular reference to the functionaries who may be giving their advice to the Minister for Finance to the Government of Mysore. It seems to me that whoever is responsible for giving assistance or suggestions to the Minister for Finance for placing these demands before the House in the form in which they have been now brought before us, has not been doing his duty by the Ministry, has not been doing his duty by the Government and has not been doing his duty by the country; and it is high time that the Minister for Finance, in view of the responsibilities which have fallen upon him and in view of the fact that he and he alone will be answerable to the country for the expenditure incurred in the name of the Government, in the name of the Party of which he is the head today—in view of these factors he should seek more competent advice from a better qualified person who should be asked to fill the post of Financial Secretary to the Government of Mysore.

Sir, the Hon'ble Member Sri Gopala Gowda went on to suggest that proposals for expenditure have been placed before this House which seemed to him to be proposals for expenditure which are necessary for placating interests or for satisfying the demands made by Hon'ble Members who might have a claim upon the Ministry or upon the Government. I have no wish to associate myself with the opinion that the Hon'ble Member Sri Gopala Gowda may hold or with the observations that he may choose to make on the floor of this House. But to me, who has taken some little trouble to read what is printed in the paper that has been handed to us—to me it seems that at least in respect of one item of expenditure, Government ought to be able to give us some convincing argument, some convincing statement of the case

for substantiating the claim for the supplementary demand which has been placed before this House. I refer to Demand No. 40 printed on page 5 of these supplementary estimates. It will be seen, Sir, that in respect of 'Irrigation Works—Unproductive' item No. 2, a token grant of Rs. 100 is asked for and the explanation given in respect of that item goes to say:

“A grant of Rs. 10,000 has been provided for construction of a new Tank at Sonnayakanahalli, Kunigal Taluk, by re-appropriation of sanctioned grants. As this is an item of new service, a token grant of Rs. 100 is applied for.”

Sir, I should like to know, if the Hon'ble the Finance Minister is in a position to give that information when he makes a reply to this debate, on what date the estimate for the construction of this Sonnayakanahalli tank was prepared, at whose instance it was prepared, who prepared it and what is the total estimated expenditure that is to be incurred for the construction of this tank; when was the administrative sanction sought for the incurring of this expenditure and when was this administrative sanction given; whether technical concurrence regarding the feasibility of the project has been obtained and so on and so forth. This information would be very interesting because I happen to know—as one belonging to Tumkur District and as one who happens to know the people and to know the topography of Kunigal taluk, though my esteemed friend who has been elected from Amruthur constituency is more or less concerned with this particular matter—I still happen to know the needs of the particular area and the feasibility or otherwise of this particular project on which this expenditure is proposed to be incurred. Representations have been made to me, though I have no manner of representative connection with that constituency or with that taluk, representations have been made to me by residents of that Taluk. Representations have also been made to many other Hon'ble Members of this House to my knowledge, complaining

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

of the proposed item of expenditure upon this particular project.

Sir, it is known to every Hon'ble Member of this House that under the Five-Year Plan a list of works proposed to be taken up is given. In that list a particular work known as Mangala Project had been included and I suppose is still included. Government have made in the previous years Budget provisions in respect of Mangala Project, but for reasons best known to themselves they have not chosen to incur any expenditure in respect of it and to the best of my knowledge, no work has been commenced in respect of this Mangala Project.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—The other day I explained the position regarding the Mangala Project, Sir. I do not know whether the Hon'ble Member was here.

SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.—This Mangala Project still forms part of the Five-Year Plan in so far as that Plan relates to Mysore State.

My Hon'ble friend the Revenue Minister shakes his head. Evidently he means that this Mangala Project has been taken off the Plan and if that is so he will certainly on the appropriate occasion state the reasons for having done that. But apart from that, the facts are that the Mangala Project had formed part of the Five-Year Plan. The Government of Mysore did provide amounts for expenditure on the Project but no expenditure was in fact incurred either during the current year or during the previous year; and this Sonnayakanahalli tank is proposed to be constructed and administrative sanction for it has been sought probably very recently, certainly not at the time when the first of the series of supplementary demands for grants or the second of the series of demands for supplementary grants were placed before this House. If this project had been sanctioned and if the proposal for incurring this expenditure was engaging the earnest consideration of the Government at earlier stages I am certain, Sir, the Government would not

choose to say that although they knew this expenditure had to be incurred before and administrative sanction for incurring expenditure had been granted before that, they purposely kept back this item from the Budget. I am sure they will not say that. Therefore, Sir, it seems to me that this project has been sanctioned in a hurry although local representations have been made against the feasibility of the project and technical opinion has not been concurrent at the various stages at which it is sought to be obtained in the usual course of the administration of the Public Works Department.

This is one of those instances in which the moneys of the State are proposed to be spent without recourse to the usual procedure that is adopted in incurring public expenditure and expenditure is sought to be incurred after the fashion of the Grand Moghul whose days we thought were over. I remember that when the Hon'ble the Finance Minister visited Kunigal Taluk, he took the occasion at some function the proceedings of which were reported in newspapers and which I have read to make a speech in which he agreed that this project should be undertaken and expenditure should be incurred upon it immediately although administrative sanction had not been granted to this project. He saw no difficulty in the way of granting that sanction then and there and he made a speech as reported in the Press which went on to show that this work was being sanctioned because his and my dear friend, the Hon'ble Member Sri Huchmasthy Gowda was anxious about this tank being constructed in that place. That was the effect of the whole speech.

SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—What is wrong in constructing a tank in his constituency?

SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.—There is nothing wrong. Nobody said that. I wish the Chief Minister had followed my speech more carefully than that. What I said was, that this is one of the instances of how expenditure is proposed to be incurred without giving adequate thought to the feasibility of the project just because circumstances exist which make it appear that this

project is very urgent and must be executed immediately without having due regard to ordinary administrative process. That is what I was saying. Sir, it would also be interesting if the Hon'ble the Finance Minister can tell us what the actual estimated cost of this tank is, why the amount of the sanctioned estimate for this work has not been mentioned here and why it is merely said that a grant of ten thousand rupees has been provided for the construction of a new tank at Sonnayakanahalli, Kunigal Taluk, by re-appropriation of sanctioned grants. It may be that a small grant of ten thousand rupees has been provided for by re-appropriation of sanctioned grants for the expenditure intended to be incurred towards the construction of that tank. But why should not the House be told what is the total expenditure that is estimated as being necessary for the construction of this tank and why is it sought to be commenced under the guise of merely asking for a token grant? This, I should like to say, is not fair to this House. When public money has to be spent, this House has to vote every item of expenditure—whether Members sit on this side of the House or Members sit on the other side of the House. Every Hon'ble Member is entitled to know, without being bound down by any other rules which have no bearing on or relation to the right of free speech on the floor of this House, every Hon'ble Member, I repeat, has a right to know all that the Government is in a position to state in respect of each item of expenditure that is proposed to be incurred from the public funds. Having regard to the slipshod manner in which these demands are being placed before the House and having regard to the utter inadequacy of the background information which ought to have been furnished to this House, I should say that the Hon'ble the Finance Minister has been less than just and less than fair to this House in approaching the House for a vote on the Supplementary Demands for Grants without giving the House all the information to which this House is entitled.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Sir, to

avoid further remarks on this I would like to draw the attention of the Hon'ble Member to page 117 *re*: the details of the estimated cost of the project.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Sir, I have finished my speech.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the concerned Minister had made a statement when the motion was moved, it would have avoided all these comments.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Sir, I was not here; I was in the Upper House.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—That is not an excuse, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If they are in the other House, it is physically impossible for them to be here also; that I have already said. So, we have to make allowances.

\*ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯ (ನಂಜನಗೂಡು-ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿಗಳು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಈ ಸ್ಲಿಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟರಿ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ, ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಿತ್ರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡರು ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರು; ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ನಂಬರು 23ರ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಶ್ರೀ ಹನುಮಯ್ಯನವರತ್ತಿಂದ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್‌ನ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವರು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೇಳಿದ ಮಾತುಗಳಿಂದ ನನಗೆ ನೋವುಂಟಾಯಿತು. ಅವರು ಜನಸಾಮಾನ್ಯರ ಹಿತ ಕಾಪಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಧಾರ್ಮಿಕರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಅವೇಶ್ಯದಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿದ ಮಾತು ಅವರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಶಂಕೆಯನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡಿತು. ಕೇವಲ ಶೇಕಡೆ ಹತ್ತು ಮಂದಿಯಿರುವ . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—All that is over, Sri Madiah; why do you rake it up?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯ.—ಆ ಮಾತಿನಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವವರಿಗೇನು ಅನುಮಾನವುಂಟಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಹೋಗಲಾಡಿಸಲು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You speak on the Demand itself.

6 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯ.—ಅವರು ಈಗ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ಅವರು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದರೆಂದು ಅವರೇ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಅವರ ಆ ಭಾವನೆ ಜನಸಾಮಾನ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಹಿತವನ್ನು ಬಯಸಿದಂತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರವರು ಈ demand ಇದುವಾಗ ಕೆಲವು ಮಂದಿ ಹರಿಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ತೃಪ್ತಿಗೊಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸಾಧುವಲ್ಲ, ನ್ಯಾಯವೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. 1952-53



(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯ.)

ನೆಯ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವರ್ಗದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರ ತಕ್ಕ ಮೊಬಲಗು 1953ನೆಯ ಸಾಲಿನ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ lapse ಆಯಿತು. ಪಾಲಿಸಿ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 1953ರ ಜುಲೈ ಮೂರನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಫಂಡು create ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಬಂದಿತು. ಪಾಲಿಸಿ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಫೀರ್ಮನ್ ಆಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರವರು ಅದಷ್ಟು ಬೇಗ ಈ ಫಂಡು create ಮಾಡುವ ಧರವನೆಯನ್ನಿತ್ತರು. ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಪಾಲಿಸಿ ದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಫಂಡು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಇಂದು create ಆದುದಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹಣ lapse ಆಗದೇ ಇರಲಿ ಎಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಫಂಡ್ create ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಯಾರೊಬ್ಬ ರನ್ನೇ ಆಗಲಿ ತೃಪ್ತಿಪಡಿಸುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನರಿತು ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡರು ಮಾತ ನಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ತರುವ ಅಗತ್ಯವಾದರೂ ಏನಿತ್ತು ಎಂದರೆ, ಈ ಹಣಕ್ಕೆ ಬರೀ executive order ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಲದು, ಬಹುಶಃ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಶಾಸನ ಪಡೆಯ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಟೀಕೆಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನೇ ಕೊಡದಂತೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ದವರು ಮೊದಲೇ ಬಡ್ಡಿ ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅಥವಾ ಜನವರಿಯ ಅದಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಬ್ ಮಿಷರಿ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಮೂಲಕ ಕೇಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ತಂದಿರುವುದು ಯಾವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನೂ ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡು ತಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಒದಗಿಸಿದ ಹಣ ರ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆಗದೇ ಇರಲಿ ಎಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ತಂದಿರುವುದೇ ಹೊರತು ಮತ್ತೆ ಬೇರೆ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಅವರು ನಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ :

“It is proposed to create a fund with an initial contribution of Rs. 2 lakhs which could be re-appropriated out of the sanctioned grants under the major head.....”

The major head is “Rural Development”. ಇಷ್ಟಾದರೂ ಸಹ ಇದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿ, ನಾಲ್ಕು ಲಕ್ಷ re-appropriation ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಇದ್ದರೆ current yearಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರಾದ ಮೊಬಲಗು ರ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆಗದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದಾದರೂ ಇದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿ ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ (ಹುಲಿಯೂರು ದುರ್ಗ).—ನನ್ನ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಏನೋ ದಾಕ್ಷಿಣ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿದರು. ಇದರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೆ ರಡು ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬಹುದು. ಸೊನ್ನಾ ಯಕನಹಳ್ಳಿ ಕೆರೆಯ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯನ್ನು 1951ನೆಯ ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ ತಿಂಗಳಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದು, ಆಗ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ವರ್ಕ್ಸ್ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಸಹ ಇದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಎಗ್ಜಿಕ್ಯೂಟಿವ್ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರಿಗೆ

ಅಂದಾಜು ಸಹ ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡುವಂತೆ ಆಜ್ಞೆ ಮಾಡಿ ದ್ದರು. ಹಾಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದರೂ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷಕಾಲ ಅಂದಾಜು ತಯಾರಾಗುವುದು ನಿಧಾನವಾಯಿತು. ಇದಾದಮೇಲೆ 1952ನೆಯ ಜನವರಿ, ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಗ್ಜಿಕ್ಯೂಟಿವ್ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರು ಬಂದು ಸ್ಥಳ ಅಜಮಾ ಯಿಷಿ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರತರಾದರು. ಅಷ್ಟು ಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ ಅದರ ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತಣ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟಕರ ವಾದ ಕ್ರಾಮ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಒದಗಿತು. ಒದಗಿ ಐದು-ಆರು ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಂದಾಯವನ್ನು ಸಹ ರೆಮಿಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅನಂತರ ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಜನರ ಮುಖಂಡರು ಕೆಲವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅಹ ವಾಲು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆರೆ ಕಟ್ಟುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಮನವಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಒಬ್ಬರಲ್ಲಿ, ಇಬ್ಬರಲ್ಲಿ, ಮೂರು ಜನ ಫೀಫ್ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರುಗಳು ಸ್ಥಳ ಅಜಮಾಯಿಷಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಉತ್ತಮವಾದ ಕೆರೆ ಕಟ್ಟಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವೆಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ನಾನು ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಜನಗಳನ್ನು ಕರೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಈ ಕೆರೆ ಕಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ದುಡ್ಡು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ಕಷ್ಟಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಮಾತ್ರವಲ್ಲ—ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಉತ್ತಮವಾದ ಕೆರೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ವಿಶೇಷವಾದ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗು ತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮನವಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಂಡೆ. ಮನವಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರೂ ಕೂಡ 1952ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. 1953ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಫೀಫ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರು, ನಾನು ಆ ಸ್ಥಳಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು ನೋಡಿ, ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು, ಕೆರೆ ಕಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ರಾಯಕ್ಕಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಕೆರೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡು ತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. 1953ನೇ ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ 23ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿವಸ ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿ ದ್ದರು. ಆಗ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಐದು-ಆರು ಸಾವಿರ ಜನ ಹೆಂಗಸರು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಆದಿಯಾಗಿ ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು ಪ್ರತಿವರ್ಷವೂ ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ಷಾಮದಿಂದ ಕಷ್ಟ ಅನುಭವಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಕೆರೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆಗ ಟೀಫ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ರಾಮ ರಾಯರು ಆ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದಿದ್ದರೂ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿರಬಹುದು. ಟೀಫ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರು ಆ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ “ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಐದು ವರ್ಷದ ಯೋಜನೆಗೆ ಖಾಸಿಹೋಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟ, ನಾನು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮದಂತೆ ಕಾನೂನುಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಶೆಯುಳ್ಳವನು; ಆದರೂ ಈ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಜನರ ಕಷ್ಟವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದು ಈ ಕಷ್ಟವನ್ನು ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಡು ತ್ತೇನೆ” ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಯಾರ ದಾಕ್ಷಿಣ್ಯಕ್ಕಾಗಿಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಯಾರ ಮೇಲಿನ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸದಿಂದಾಗಲಿ ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಬಂಡಿತ ವಾಗಿಯೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಇನ್ನೂ ಸುಮಾರು ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್.—ನವೆಂಬರ್ ತಿಂಗಳಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಕೆರೆಯ ಎಸ್ಸಿಮೇಟು ತಯಾರಾಗಿ administrative sanction ದೊರೆತ ಮೇಲೆ

ಡಿ ಸೆಂ ಬ ರ ನಲ್ಲಿ Irrigation Enquiry  
ಆಯಿತು. ಅಮೇಲೆ ಆ ಕೆರೆಯನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುವ  
ಒಂದು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ದುಡ್ಡು  
ಒದಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಅದನ್ನು  
ತಳ್ಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದರು. ಮಂಗಳ ಪ್ರಾಜೆಕ್ಟು ಕೂಡ  
ನ್ನು ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ. ಮಂಗಳ ಪ್ರಾಜೆಕ್ಟಿಗೆ 1952  
ನೇ ಇನೆಯು ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ 1 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಒದಗಿ  
ನಿಡ್ತರು. 1953 ನೇ ಇನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 2 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ  
ಒದಗಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಸ್ಥಳ ನಿರ್ಧರ  
ವಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಸ್ಥಳ ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋದ ಚಿಕ್ಕಿ ಕರ  
ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರೇ ನೀರಿನ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಎಷ್ಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಕೆರೆ  
ಯಾವ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕೆಂಬ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾ  
ಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಇದ್ದು ದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ನಡೆಸಿದರು. ಮಾನ್ಯ  
ರವರನ್ನೂ ಸಚಿವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು ಕೆರೆ  
ಕಟ್ಟುವ ಸ್ಥಳ ನೋಡಿದರು. ಚಿಕ್ಕಿ ಕರ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು  
ಬಂದಾಗ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು  
ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಗೇಜ್ ಸ್ತಡಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಆ  
ಮೇಲೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು.  
ಅಂದಾಜು ತಯಾರ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರು ಸೈಟು  
ಗಳನ್ನು ಆಳಿದು ನೋಡಿದರು. ಆ ಮೂರು ಸೈಟು  
ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು  
ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಮುಳುಗಡೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬ ಅಂಕಿ  
ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನೋಡಿ ಮಧ್ಯ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆರೆ  
ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಚೀಫ್ ಎಂಜಿನಿಯರ್  
ವರು ಕಡೆಯದಾಗಿ ನೋಡಿಸಿದರು. ಅದರಂತೆ ಮಧ್ಯ  
ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ 200 ಎಕರೆ ತರಿ  
ಜಮೀನು ಮುಳುಗಡೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಸರ್ವಾ  
ರದವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು  
ನೋಡಿ, ಗೇಜ್ ಸ್ತಡಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಂತ್ಯತೀರ್ಮಾನ  
ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಸರ್ವಾರದವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿ  
ಕೊಂಡರು. ಆ ಸಮಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೊನ್ನಾಯ  
ಕನಹಳ್ಳಿಗೆ ಅಡ್ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟಿವ್ ಸ್ಟಾಂಕ್ಷನ್ ಆಗಿದ್ದುದ  
ರಿಂದ ಮಂಗಳ ಪ್ರಾಜೆಕ್ಟಿಗೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನೇ  
ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಂದ್ರದ ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿ  
ಟೆನ್ನಿಗೆ ಬರೆದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದು  
ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಮೇಲೆ 8 ಲಕ್ಷ  
94 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಅಂದಾಜಿಗೆ ಈ ವರ್ಷದ  
ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಪ್ರೊವೈಡ್  
ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯ.  
ಈ ಎರಡು ಕೆರೆಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ನನ್ನ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ  
ದರಿಂದ ನನ್ನ ಮೇಲೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್  
ರಾಮರಾಯರಿಗಾಗಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಇತರ ಮಾನ್ಯ  
ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗಾಗಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಗಿಂತ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ  
ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿಯೇ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.  
ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಭಾಗದ  
ಜನಗಳ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳಗಾಗಿ ಅದೇ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿರ  
ತಕ್ಕ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಭಾಗದ ಜನಗಳ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸವನ್ನು  
ಗಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಪಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದು ನನಗೇ ಹಾನಿ  
ಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಅದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.  
ಆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೊತ್ತುಕೊಂಡಿ  
ದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸರ್ವಾರದವರಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಯಾವ ಲೋಪ  
ದೋಷವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ, ಚಿಕ್ಕಿ ಕರ ಒಪ್ಪಿನಿ  
ಯನ್ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬ  
ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಮಂಗಳ ಕೆರೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ  
ಆಗಲೇ ಡಿಮಾಂಡಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತ ತಿಳಿಸಿ  
ದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿದೆ. ಎರಡು

ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಎರಡನೇ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆ  
ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ತಯಾರಾಗಿರ  
ತಕ್ಕ ಮೂರೋನಹಳ್ಳಿ ಬಲಗಡೆನಾಿಗೆ ನೀರು ಒದಗಿ  
ಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏರ್ಪಾಡಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಇಷ್ಟು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿ  
ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ರಾಮರಾಯರು ನನ್ನ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಿರತಕ್ಕ  
ಕೆಲಸದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಏನಾ  
ದರೂ ಅನುಮಾನ ಇದ್ದಿದ್ದು ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಹಾರ  
ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ  
ಅವರನ್ನು ವಂದಿಸಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

\*Sri T. MARIAPP (Mysore City  
North).—SIR, I would not have spoken  
but for the fact that my name has been  
dragged into the discussion that fol  
lowed. I am afraid my Hon'ble friend  
Sri Huchmasthy Gowda has not placed  
all the facts before this House. He  
admitted the need and the necessity for  
the Mangala project being executed.  
Sir, it was a great surprise to me to see  
the manner in which the Hon'ble Minis  
ter for Public Works said that Mangala  
Project has been given the go-by. After  
taking the technical opinion the esti  
mate was prepared; even the site had  
been selected and it had been included  
in the Five-Year Plan and even the  
Planning Commission had accorded  
sanction to that project. Sir, as Sri  
Huchmasthy Gowda himself grants,  
there is need for constructing this Man  
gala project. The rain water that is car  
ried in that valley is all going to waste  
and it is going out to the Madras area  
without being used in our State. There  
is therefore every need to conserve that  
water and provide water for irrigation  
for the people of that area. It was only  
after taking technical opinion that that  
project was contemplated and estimates  
were prepared and the project included  
in the Five-Year Plan. Latterly, I  
understand that the Mangala project  
was given up. Definitely in the Budget  
of 1952 money was provided and even  
in 1953 definitely money had been pro  
vided for execution of the Mangala  
project. Sir, if at any stage it was  
contemplated to substitute Sonnayaka  
nahally tank for Mangala project as  
observed by Sri M. V. Rama Rao, I  
think the House ought to have been  
informed of the circumstances under  
which Sonnayakanahally project was  
taken up in preference to the Mangala  
project. If the Government's idea is  
to abandon the Mangala project, I  
would not approve and I am sure the

(SRI T. MARIAPPA.)

House would not approve of that idea at all. My friend suggested that the approval to the expenditure has also been obtained and Sonnayakanahally project was being taken up in preference to Mangala project. The House is not aware of that. That information has not been furnished to this House even in the Finance Minister's Budget speech. Therefore, it is a great surprise to us to see that Mangala project has been abandoned at this stage. Even when the supplementary grant was asked for, they should have been pleased to mention the circumstances. It is true under the development budget, they have mentioned in the Budget of 1954-55 and not in 1953-54. Therefore, naturally, it is up to the Hon'ble Members of this House to ask for an explanation from the Finance Minister or the Public Works Minister. It was in that context that this vital question has been raised by Sri Rama Rao. Therefore there can be no objection. If it is the intention to take up some other project in preference to Mangala project, I along with Sri Rama Rao certainly raise my objection.

\*Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—Sir, about 35 projects, including about 15 new projects, were included in the Five-Year Plan. In many cases the site had not been settled when they were included in the Five-Year Plan. There is documentary evidence to substantiate what I am saying. In the case of Mangala Reservoir, no doubt money had been provided and Government were anxious to take up the project. But, Sir, you know there is a Technical Advisory Committee consisting of the retired Chief Engineer and the Chief Engineer and the Minister for Public Works. In important cases this Technical Advisory Committee visits the spot. When we inspected this spot, we were of the view that we should conduct gauging for a period of two years before we take up the project. A meeting was held and in accordance with the opinion of the Technical Advisory Committee I had to defer the project. It is not as if *suo moto* I have abandoned the scheme. The gauging

should be conducted for a period of two years. In the meanwhile this scheme is proposed to be taken up and we sought the permission of the Planning Commission to take up this scheme instead of Mangala project which is deferred at present.

Then, Sir, there are a number of works as could be seen from the Budget and also the Supplementary Demands. For instance, under Demand No. 9 there are three works; they are (1) constructing an Anicut across Doddanakatte village, (2) increasing the capacity of Sulebele tank and (3) restoring Nagarbhavi tank near Halehalli, Goribidnur Taluk. Sir, it is not as if to placate the members that these demands have been brought. As a democratic Government we are bound to comply with the requests of the members whenever they are reasonable and feasible. For instance, majority of the members of Hassan District approached and pressed that this work should be taken up. They were demanding for that project for the last several years. I said, 'we will take up this year'. I appeal to members that it is not correct to impute motives to this. So far as I am concerned, I take the responsibility of deferring the Mangala project in view of the opinion furnished by the Technical Advisory Committee. As regards the details of the project, the estimated cost of the project, it is mentioned in the budget and administrative sanction was accorded in the month of October 1953.

\*Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—Sir, I would not take more than one minute to refer to two demands—Demand Nos. 26 and 41. I would like to assure the Leader of the Opposition that these demands arose only in the month of February 1954. There was a labour dispute between the Electric Factory and the Labour Association and the Appellate Tribunal, in their order dated 13th February 1954, directed certain payments and negotiations were entered into between the Labour Association and the Management. We came to some conclusion only on 15th March 1954. By this arrangement we would be able to save substantially to Government. I have

got the money readily available. Since it is a new service the Accountant-General advised us to treat it as a fresh token and take the approval of this House. Hence this Demand.

With regard to Demand No. 41—Spun Cast Iron Plant, it is a scheme for Rs. 45 lakhs sanctioned by Government and approved by the Government of India and that will have to be done only out of the loan grant. They have granted 12.5 lakhs with the condition that the work will have to be expedited and substantial amount will have to be spent. In order to comply with the desire of the Government of India we proposed spending 9.5 lakhs during the current year only out of the amount of loan that has been sanctioned by Government of India. Hence this is a new demand. This also arose very recently. I too agree with the Hon'ble Members that at the earliest possible moment we should bring supplementary demands.

**Sri T. CHANNIAH** (Minister for Public Health and Local Self-Government).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was decided some time back to create a Depressed Class Amelioration Fund. This was also announced by the Chief Minister in his Budget speech. The matter was accordingly brought before the Legislature for its approval. In this connection I might say that this has been a long cherished desire of the members of the Harijan Community. Sir, I am personally aware for several years that grants allotted for the several measures for upliftment of this community lapsed in many cases. On behalf of the members of the Harijan community I wish to express my deep sense of gratitude to Government for having created this fund because hereafter moneys earmarked for Depressed Class ameliorative measures will not lapse if unspent but will go to a fund.

Secondly, the Government of India have approved the schemes like cottage industry, for the upliftment of the Tribes. A Commissioner for Depressed Classes has been appointed and he is taking action to implement the schemes.

\***Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO** (Minister for Law and Education).—Sir, I have only two sentences to say. In

order to relieve unemployment, 500 teachers were sought to be appointed by the Government of India and the correspondence commenced in the month of December and it was finalised in the month of January. We have to fix up institutions, equip them, appoint teachers and calculate the cost. We wrote to the Accountant-General a letter dated 23rd March 1954. I believe I was quite in time. I am not either too early or too late.

**Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA** (Chief Minister).—Sir, it is very unfortunate for me that I have not got time at all to reply. I very much wish I had at least fifteen minutes time in order to meet the several allegations that have been made against this Ministry. I will take another opportunity and for the present I would say that all the expenditure shown here will not be a fresh burden on the finances of the State. Most of the items themselves declare that they will be met out of re-appropriation and Central assistance. Especially, for the Bhadra Reservoir the Central Government have given a loan and that will be met out of this fund.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—The question is :

“That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the list of Additional and Supplementary Demands for Grants for the year 1953-54, circulated among the Members be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March 1954 in respect of Demands Nos. 9, 18, 23, 26, 29, 34, 40, 41 and 42.”

*The motion was adopted.*

[As directed by the Speaker, the motions for Demands which have been adopted are reproduced below.]

#### DEMAND No. 9.—IRRIGATION

##### 19. CONSTRUCTION OF IRRIGATION, NAVIGATION, EMBANKMENT AND DRAINAGE WORKS.

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 300 be granted to the Government to defray the

charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1954, in respect of 'Construction of Irrigation, Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works'."

---

**DEMAND No. 18.—EDUCATION**  
37. EDUCATION

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1954, in respect of 'Education'."

---

**DEMAND No. 23.—RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

40-A. RURAL DEVELOPMENT

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 200 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1954, in respect of 'Rural Development'."

---

**DEMAND No. 26.—INDUSTRIES**

43. INDUSTRIES AND SUPPLIES  
(EXCEPT SERICULTURE)

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1954, in respect of 'Industries and Supplies (Except Sericulture)'."

---

**DEMAND No. 29.—CIVIL WORKS**  
50. CIVIL WORKS

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 500 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1954, in respect of 'Civil Works'."

---

**DEMAND No. 34.—MISCELLANEOUS**

57. MISCELLANEOUS

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1954, in respect of 'Miscellaneous'."

---

**DEMAND No. 40.—IRRIGATION**

68. CONSTRUCTION OF IRRIGATION, NAVIGATION, EMBANKMENT AND DRAINAGE WORKS OUTSIDE THE REVENUE ACCOUNT.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 200 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1954, in respect of 'Construction of Irrigation, Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works outside the Revenue Account'."

---

**DEMAND No. 41.—INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT**

72. CAPITAL OUTLAY ON INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1954, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Industrial Development'."

---

DEMAND No. 42 —ELECTRICITY  
SCHEMESSchemes outside the Revenue  
Account'."81-A. CAPITAL OUTLAY ON ELECTRI-  
CITY SCHEMES OUTSIDE THE REVENUE  
ACCOUNT.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1954, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Electricity

---

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise for the day and meet to-morrow at 12 NOON.

---

*The House adjourned at Thirty Minutes past Six of the Clock to meet at 12 noon on Tuesday, the 30th March 1954.*

---